

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

The title of the invention is objected to as not descriptive. A new title is proposed herein.

The Abstract and the description of Fig. 4 in the specification are also objected to. A substitute Abstract is included herewith together with the correction to the specification as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter is entered.

Claim 1 was objected to for several informalities which have been corrected herein.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smyth (U.S. 6,678,246) in view of Yokoyama et al. (U.S. 5,303,344) and further claims 2-7, 9, 11-16 and 18 are rejected as above and further in view of Locascio (U.S. 6,603,757).

The Office Action relies on Yokoyama et al. to show applicant's claimed third processing unit and a highway switch. The Office Action asserts the data transfer processor which is part of the protocol processor handles the layer four functionality.

An IP communication interface device according to applicant's claim 1 differs from the cited references, Smyth, Yokoyama et al. (Yokoyama), and Locascio for at least the following reasons:

In claim 1, first and second media-corresponding data include voice data transmitted from a voice terminal having a voice communication function, facsimile data transmitted from a facsimile terminal having a facsimile communication function and data transmitted from a data terminal having a data communication function.

In contrast to the combination of references applicant claims the three functions thus processing three kinds of information that include the voice data, the facsimile data and the data.

The combination of references does not disclose such a feature as described in independent claims.

In contrast Smyth describes an apparatus (IP gateway 20 in FIGS. 3, 8, and 9) for processing data packets, and in Yokoyama, a computer (1 in FIG. 2) and a protocol processor include the voice data, the facsimile data and the data as the first and second media-corresponding data.

It is respectfully submitted that the DSP (305 in FIG. 9 of Smyth) in the apparatus (IP gateway) does not correspond to a first processing unit (931, 932, 933 in FIG. 7) in applicant's claim 1.

This is because nowhere in Smyth is there a description that the DSP (305) has a function for coding the first media-corresponding data and a function for decoding packet-disassembled media-corresponding data into which a packet of the second media-corresponding data because input/output data to/from a TDM I/F (300) are TDM data. Smyth fails to make such a teaching.

In addition the Smyth apparatus (IP gateway) does not further describe a third processing unit (applicant's 53 in FIG. 7) as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Also Yokoyama only shows that data transfer processors (100-1, 100-2, 100-3 in FIG. 8) have a header processing function of layers 4, 3 and 2 respectively and are connected in a pipeline form.

The further reference Locascio, as shown in FIG. 1, discloses a VoIP communication function provided to a terminal which is accommodated in a PSTN or a PBX by a structure including a voice/data access concentrator card (48), a digital network T1/E1/J1 smart line card (26), and a line card IO (20).

However Locascio does not explicitly disclose to processing of three kinds of information that include the voice data, the facsimile data and the data.

Thus, in combination the references Smyth and Yokoyama do not disclose or suggest the collaboration relationship of the first and second connecting units in the present invention.

Each of the respective independent claims and dependent claims provides at least the distinguishing features as pointed out above.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully requested the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJY 18.090 (100794-11566)
BSM:jh